



Department of Poultry Science

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Faculty Annual Evaluation Policy – 2022

The Department of Poultry Science developed and adopted the following Annual Evaluation Policy (AEP) to assure all faculty are evaluated based upon clear, transparent, and academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics that ensure academic freedom. This policy is based on UGA Academic Affairs Policies 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation and 1.10-10 Student Success Activities. Should any modifications to UGA policies result in contradictions to Department of Poultry Science AEP, the UGA policy will supersede the departmental AEP, and the Department will adjust and approve changes to the departmental policy to comply with UGA policies.

Faculty in Poultry Science are required annually submit:

1. An electronic copy of UGA Elements annual activity report (past 3 years)
2. Reflection on prior calendar year goals and current calendar year goals
3. End of course student evaluations (for faculty with a Teaching appointment)
4. A summarized list of programmatic Extension outputs and a small number of sentences of why these made a difference (for faculty with an Extension appointment)
5. Supplemental material (e.g. student success activities)
6. Any self-assessments (optional)

These evaluation documents are due to the Department Head by January 15. Failure to submit the required evaluation information will result in an evaluation rating of “1” for each area of responsibility lacking the required documentation. The department head will meet and discuss annual performance annually during February and early March. This meeting will also serve as an opportunity to review and if needed, adjust the Allocation of Effort of the faculty member. The meeting will also serve as an opportunity for faculty members to share their goals for the current calendar year. All faculty members will sign a statement to acknowledge that they have been apprised of the content of their annual written evaluation.

Faculty Response to Review

A faculty member may respond to their annual evaluation in writing within 10 working days; any such response will be attached to the annual written evaluation. Within 10 working days of the faculty member’s response, the evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of the faculty member’s written response. This acknowledgement will also become part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review or appeal.

Content of Written Annual Review

The written annual evaluation will include up to four sections, depending on faculty position responsibilities:

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Extension
4. Service
5. Overall Evaluation

The written evaluation for each section will include a brief narrative description of the outputs, quality, impact, and efforts to improve reported by the faculty member. The evaluation will also note whether the faculty member indicates their involvement in student success activities as part of their research, teaching, and/or service work, and effort to implement at least 1 student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness. In addition, the written evaluation will provide a rating on a 5-point scale (see above) for teaching, research, Extension, service, and overall evaluation.

The annual evaluation letter template (**Appendix A**), including specific rubric components was adopted by the Poultry Science faculty and will be utilized to assure compliance with USG and UGA policy in the annual evaluation components and process requirements.

Developmental Response to 1 and 2 Ratings

If the performance overall or in any of the assigned areas of effort is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to help improve their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period.

The Department Head will establish an Evaluation Committee (comprised of at least 3 faculty). The Department Head and the Evaluation Committee will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member within 30 days of the annual evaluation. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The Evaluation Committee will review each PRP and provide revisions if the PRP falls short of these expectations. The PRP must include the following components:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
3. A timetable
4. Available resources and supports
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

The PRP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel records.

Two meetings each during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and consider planned accomplishments for the upcoming

semester. After each meeting, the should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. At the request of the faculty member, the Evaluation Committee will review the summaries and evaluation of whether the faculty member is on track. Consequences for failing to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting.

A tenured faculty member evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the assigned areas of effort, for which the assigned allocation of effort exceeds 10%, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post tenure review, as described in the Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. Note that the 1 or 2 rating does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next. Consequences of failing to comply with a PRP, would result in a 1 or 2 rating in the subsequent year. For non-tenured faculty, their contract would be subject to a non-renewal.

Relationship of the annual review to promotion and tenure

Written annual evaluations are included in third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review materials.

Teaching Guidelines for the Department of Poultry Science

A teaching appointment in the Department of Poultry Science is governed by university, college and departmental policies. All faculty with a teaching appointment in the department will be evaluated by the Department Head annually and by senior faculty members based on promotion and tenure and post tenure review guidelines. Assessment of teaching within the department is based on quantity and quality metrics. Based on their assigned workload allocation effort each faculty member will have quantity expectations based on the following guidelines:

1. For academic contract faculty with a total EFT of 0.75, a 50% teaching appointment (or 0.375 FTE) has an expectation of four 3-credit hour courses across the fall and spring semesters. For fiscal contract faculty with a total EFT of 1.0, a 50% teaching appointment (or 0.50 EFT) has an expectation of five 3-credit hour courses during the contract year. Note Freshman Odyssey and GradFIRST courses do not count in EFT calculations due to the supplemental pay associated with teaching them. <https://provost.uga.edu/policies/academic-affairs-policy-manual/1-07-compensation-and-workload/#p-1-07-8> (1.07-6.0 Effort Assignment for Instructional Activities).
2. Minimum student enrollment is 10 students for undergraduate courses and 5 students for graduate courses as set by the University. Exceptions to this rule can be granted when offering a course below the minimum enrollment threshold is necessary for students to graduate within the expected time frame. However, continual exceptions in order for students to meet their major course requirements for graduation are not permitted, and thus the course will be eliminated as a major requirement and discontinued, or if it is group of courses within a major, the major itself will be eliminated for not meeting required graduating student number guidelines.

Teaching assessment for promotion and tenure

For promotion and tenure, the assessment is heavily focused on teaching quality/effectiveness, because the expectation is that teaching quantity as discussed in the proceeding section is being met.

The Standard

Teaching helps students develop knowledge, skills, and abilities within their chosen discipline and dispositions to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarly knowledge and their teaching expertise. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. Use of the term "effective" and "effectiveness" throughout the document refers to the need to provide data that have been systematically collected and analyzed to support claims about teaching quality and teaching improvement. The term "systematic" means that evidence of contributions to teaching has been gathered, reviewed, and presented in an organized and methodical way that aims to reduce potential bias, allow for coherent evaluation, and promote continuous teaching improvement.

Documentation

Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and development and in improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. At the University level, evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, **any combination of two or more of the numbered categories (#1-9)** listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution. Measures of effectiveness emphasized by the Department of Poultry Science are **highlighted in yellow**.

1. Effectiveness shown by multiple forms of evidence, including two or more of the following:
 - a) **A list of courses and information from student end-of-course surveys designed to reflect teaching effectiveness and creativity, rather than popularity. In such cases, information for all courses taught in the previous three years that have been evaluated should be included unless a candidate seeks early promotion, in which case information for two years is sufficient. The candidate should report appropriate quantitative data (i.e., range, mode) for items that provide summary evaluations of the course and instructor, if collected by the department or unit. The Department of Poultry Science stipulates that if student evaluations are to be used for this documentation that 60% or greater of the enrolled students in the course need to have participated in the evaluation.**
 - b) **Indicators of ongoing efforts to make teaching decisions based on evidence and to improve teaching and instruction, such as reflection on course evaluation results, observations of the candidate's instruction, and examples of student work. The Department of Poultry Science highly encourages its teaching faculty to add supplemental course specific questions to the standard CAES evaluation questions in order to elicit feedback that can be used to improve course instruction and document successful course and or teaching modifications.**

- c) Program surveys of alumni attesting to the candidate's instructional contributions to alumni preparation for further education and careers.
- d) Letters of support from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional performance both within the traditional classroom setting and beyond it.
- e) Performance of students on uniform examinations, in standardized courses, or from assessment data collected as part of program outcomes assessment.
- f) Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including examples of student work or information to show the students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
- g) Effective direction of graduate study including theses and dissertations. Documentation should include patterns of student progress toward degree, retention of students in programs and research group, or student scholarship or creative works.
- h) Evidence of successful direction of individual students in independent studies, special student projects, or student seminars.

2. Effectiveness shown by peer evaluation of expertise in instruction, including any of the following:

- a) Systematic observations of instruction at multiple time points by peers trained in the use of established measures of effective teaching (e.g., observation protocols, rubrics, review of instructional materials).
- b) Selection for teaching special courses and programs.
- c) Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, or international study and development projects.
- d) Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams or special commissions.
- e. Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.

3. Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students.

4. Development or significant revision of programs and courses, including any of the following:

- a) Preparation of effective teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
- b) Reflection over time on positive and negative comments from student end-of course evaluations and on course assessment data. Reflection should summarize actions taken to maintain or build on positive course elements and to modify problematic elements.
- c) Collaborative work on courses, programs, and curricula within the University or across institutions.

5. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

6. Publication activities related to teaching, including any of the following:

- a) Textbooks, curriculum materials, published lecture notes, abstracts, or peer reviewed articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and teaching scholarship.
- b) Adoption of a candidate's instructional materials such as textbooks and online materials, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.

c. Presentation of papers on teaching before professional societies.

7. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative and evidence-based educational activities or to fund stipends for students.

8. Departmental or institutional governance or academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching. In addition, the Department of Poultry Science includes in this category:

- a) Promotion of student professional development.
- b) Participation in the recruitment and retention of Poultry Science, Avian Biology, Animal Health, and Biological Science students.
- c) Effective mentoring of Poultry Science, Avian Biology, Animal Health, and Biological Science students in course work, meeting degree requirements and undergraduate and graduate research.

9. Sustained participation in teaching professional development that aligns with the candidate's efforts to improve their teaching, and demonstration of how participation has impacted the candidate's teaching practice.

Timing and required materials for teaching assessment for promotion and tenure and post tenure review
For promotion and tenure and for post tenure review, an accounting of teaching activities and their effectiveness will need to be documented in the faculty member's CV. For assistant and associate professors there will be a senior faculty driven review of their material on annual basis. For full professors a post tenure review will occur at a minimum of every 5 years.

Teaching assessment for annual evaluation

An annual evaluation of all faculty by the Department Head is required. As part of this evaluation, faculty members with an assigned teaching EFT will have their teaching efforts assessed. The University stipulates that teaching evaluations should be more than just the number of classes taught and must include an assessment of quality of teaching (e.g., peer reviews, student evaluations, demand for classes from students, enrollments, development of innovative teaching approaches), and involvement in student success activities such as mentoring, advising, supervising independent study. The University also stipulates that the annual evaluation be completed using the following 5-point scale:

- 1 – Does not meet expectations
- 2 – Needs improvement
- 3 – Meets expectations
- 4 - Exceeds expectations
- 5 – Exemplary

To provide guidance to the Department Head, the poultry science faculty established the standard for the “3 – meets expectations rating” would be to require a faculty member to be meeting the teaching requirement for their given appointment percentage as well as meeting the course enrollment requirements as set by the University. As a reminder, for academic contract faculty with a total EFT of 0.75, a 50% teaching appointment (or 0.375 FTE) has an expectation of four 3-credit hour courses across the fall and spring semesters. For fiscal contract faculty with a total EFT of 1.0, a 50% teaching appointment (or 0.50 EFT) has an expectation of five 3-credit hour courses during the contract year. Note Freshman Odyssey and GradFIRST courses do not count in EFT calculations due to the supplemental pay associated with teaching them. The minimum student enrollment is 10 students for undergraduate courses and 5 students for graduate courses as set by the University.

While this guidance gives the Department Head the annual responsibility of assessing teaching quality/effectiveness for each faculty member with a teaching appointment when assigning an evaluation score on the 5-point scale, senior faculty within the department will also be assessing teaching quality/effectiveness of teaching faculty through their involvement in the promotion and tenure and post tenure process.

The Department of Poultry Science faculty also established 2 other principles to guide the evaluation of teaching:

1. If a faculty member’s teaching effort is **consistently** exceeding their appointment level, a faculty member has the option in consultation with the department head, to request an appointment adjustment that will better reflect their efforts. For assistant professors such a request would ideally be complete before or during their third-year review.
2. Improving an annual teaching evaluation score of a “1 – does not meet expectations” or a “2 – needs improvement”, may exceed one year, especially for courses taught only once a year or every other year.

Additional new components for annual evaluations that overlap with teaching

1. Student success activities in teaching

As specified in University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3, criteria for promotion and tenure shall include evaluation of teaching faculty members’ involvement in student success activities. Student success activities is a comprehensive term for teaching faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort, but is included within the faculty member’s allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable.

Assessment will focus on documenting a faculty member’s quality involvement in a small number of student success activities. The University provides an exhaustive list of student success activities that

can apply for instruction, research, service and/or administrative appointments. The faculty in the Department of Poultry Science have decided to emphasize some of the possible activities that could apply to a faculty members' assigned teaching effort, but this emphasis does not exclude the use of other teaching related student success activities by a faculty member.

In the lists below, the column "How to capture" indicates how the specific item can be documented in UGA Elements. When there is no entry in that column for a particular item, the item/s will need to be documented in a separate synopsis document for annual evaluation.

| Name and description | How to capture |
|---|---|
| Development of new courses | Elements >> Instruction >> Course developed |
| Conducting review session for class | Annual teaching synopsis |
| Recording new videos and course materials for existing courses | Annual teaching synopsis |
| Using active learning strategies to increase student engagement in class | Annual teaching synopsis |
| One-on-one student meetings related to enhancing the understanding of course material | Annual teaching synopsis |
| Active supervision/mentoring of teaching assistants and graduate students teaching | Elements>> Instruction >> Student/postdoc supervision >> supervised teaching activity |
| Guest lecturing (at UGA) | Elements >> Instruction >> Guest teaching |
| Facilitating/participating in teaching workshops | Elements >> Admin >> Event administration |
| Performing teaching observations (peer and self) and midsemester formative evaluations by CTL | CTL feedback letter |
| Teaching of first year odyssey lectures or grad first seminars | Elements >> Instruction >> Course developed |
| Organizing study abroad program | Elements if new course developed or annual teaching synopsis |
| Organizing domestic field study program | Elements if new course developed or annual teaching synopsis |
| Making course materials more accessible to students | Annual teaching synopsis |
| One-on-one student meetings related to mentoring/advising students | Annual teaching synopsis |

Materials to provide for the annual evaluation related to teaching

Department of Poultry Science faculty will provide an annual Elements report that covers their activity from January 1 to December 31 of a given year. Elements is automatically populated with all assigned teaching activity and this includes course enrollments. In addition to the Elements report, faculty with a teaching appointment will be required to submit summarized student evaluations prepared by the

Department Head's administrative assistant for each course they have taught in the reporting period in which 60% or more of the enrolled students participated. Faculty with a teaching appointment while also be required to provide a brief teaching synopsis that covers:

1. Student success activities related to teaching.
2. Service activities related to teaching and their impact.
3. Any important teaching activities not captured in Elements.

Research Guidelines for the Department of Poultry Science

Research productivity is the responsibility of each faculty member. Research must contribute to and be symbiotic with teaching, extension and service roles. Each faculty member is expected to develop a research program, the depth of which reflects professional interests as well as Departmental goals. Each faculty member must develop a research focus area, i.e. claiming a research niche for which he/she is nationally or internationally recognized. For promotion and tenure purposes, publication quality and usefulness must be assessed by letters from peers, evidence that research has been adopted or has influenced peers and users of research results, and awards or other recognition of excellence. Other evidence that a faculty member is increasing in professional stature and interacting constructively with students, colleagues, and the profession as a whole must be provided. While the research program expectations (quantity) vary with one's appointment and areas of expertise vary widely within the Department of Poultry Science, the quality of one's research productivity must be high.

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor that provide clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature and regional and national authority include:

1. Contribution of innovative knowledge in the candidate's area of expertise. Publication of research in refereed scientific journals of national or international significance. Written accounts of research, in particular those reviewed by peers, are the primary indicators of research productivity. Publication in a variety of both poultry-oriented journals (Poultry Science, Journal of Applied Poultry Research, British Poultry Science, etc.) and discipline-oriented journals (physiology, nutrition, pathology, food science, heredity, economics, behavior, etc.) is preferred. Publication of books, book chapters and research bulletins also provide strength to a candidate's application for promotion. In addition, textbooks, edited volumes, and other materials that are intended primarily to be tools for instruction are judged as research output to the extent that they present new ideas or constitute conceptual or empirical innovation. Also valued are published, invited and selected papers presented at scientific and/or professional meetings, and other peer reviewed publications, as well as scientific and industry conference proceedings, and workshop papers.
2. Demonstration of success in obtaining extramural support for innovative or collaborative research.

3. Demonstration of the emergence of a successful research program. Evidence of this includes successful training of graduate students and publication of their research projects, other research productivity such as product development, germplasm releases, and patents, and increases in the rate of productivity in terms of annual publication numbers or extramural funding over time.
4. Receipt of national recognition of research accomplishments within the candidate's area of expertise. This can be demonstrated through e.g., awards, honors, and other recognitions for research accomplishments, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to research, etc.

Criteria for Tenure

1. Criteria listed above in this category.
2. Likely to continue satisfying the needs of the department for the specific expertise of the candidate.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor that provide clear and convincing evidence of being a regional and national authority include:

1. Demonstration of significant and innovative contributions to the candidate's area of expertise since promotion to Associate Professor.
2. Continuation of publishing in peer-reviewed journals of national and international importance within the candidate's area of expertise.
3. Demonstration of leadership of a developed, sustainable research program supported by extramural funding. Evidence of this includes successful training of graduate students and publication of their research projects, other research productivity such as product development, germplasm releases, and patents, and increases in the rate of productivity in terms of annual publication numbers or extramural funding over time.
4. Providing successful leadership in collaborative research efforts. While we highly encourage collaboration, the unique contribution by the faculty member must be able to be delineated. Demonstration of a successful research program must not be predominately from collaborations led from outside of the faculty member's program.
5. Receiving recognition as a research leader at the national or international level in the candidate's area of expertise. This can be demonstrated through e.g., awards, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to research, invitations to serve on funding review panels, service on editorial boards, evidence of high impact articles, etc.).

To achieve the rank of full professor, all of the criteria listed above must be satisfied, and the candidate must continue satisfying the needs of the department for the specific research

expertise of the candidate. If the candidate excels at one or two of these goals in particular, even in the absence of achieving one or more of the others, awarding the rank of full professor will still be considered at the discretion of the committee.

Additional new components for annual evaluations that overlap with research

Student success activities in research

As specified in University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3, criteria for promotion and tenure shall include evaluation of faculty members’ involvement in student success activities. Student success activities is a comprehensive term for faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort, but is included within the faculty member’s allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable.

Assessment will focus on documenting a faculty member’s quality involvement in a small number of student success activities. The University provides an exhaustive list of student success activities that can apply for instruction, research, service and/or administrative appointments. The faculty in the Department of Poultry Science have decided to emphasize some of the possible activities that could apply to a faculty members’ assigned effort, but this emphasis does not exclude the use of other related student success activities by a faculty member.

In the lists below, the column “How to capture” indicates how the specific item can be documented in UGA Elements. When there is no entry in that column for a particular item, the item/s will need to be documented in a separate synopsis document for annual evaluation.

| Name and description | How to capture |
|--|--|
| Student co-authorship of research papers | Elements >> Scholarly & ... >> ... |
| Supervising CURO student research | Elements >> Instruction >> Tutoring >> Undergraduate |
| Supervising CAES undergrad research initiative student projects | Elements >> Instruction >> Tutoring >> Undergraduate |
| Supervising undergraduate research students leading to conference presentation by the undergraduate students | Elements >> Instruction >> Tutoring >> Undergraduate |
| Thesis and dissertation supervision | Elements >> Instruction >> Student supervision |
| Organizing practice sessions for students’ conference presentations | |
| Sponsoring students to attend conferences | Via student authorship in conference presentations? |

| | |
|---|--|
| Helping prepare graduate students for the job market towards completion of their degrees (reviewing job talks, practices for interview, presentations, etc) | |
| Mentoring writing (reading drafts) of graduate students' thesis | |
| Involving graduate students in grant writing as advisable | |
| Serving in grad students research committee | Elements >> Instruction >> Student supervision |

Method of Annual Assessment

Faculty will be ranked 1-5 by the department head based on research activities listed and scored as indicated below.

PUBLICATIONS

Average # of pubs submitted over last 3 years (1pt each)

Average # of pubs from PIs lab (PI or grad student) over the past 3 years (4pts each)

Average # of pubs as co-author (not from PIs lab) over past 3 years (1pt each)

Average # book chapters over last 3 years (2pts each)

**Note – if Department Head determines that publication is of particularly high impact or includes a large # of experiments, he/she may award additional points*

EXTRAMURAL OR INTRAMURAL FUNDING

Grant proposals submitted during assessment year (1pt each)

Intramural grants awarded over last 3 years (1pt each)

of non-federal Grants, gifts or sales/service awarded <\$100K over last three years (2pts each)

of non-federal Grants, gifts, or sales/service awarded >\$100K over last three years (3pts each)

of federal grants won <\$100K over last 3 years (3pts each)

of federal grants won >\$100K over last 3 years (5pts)

PRESENTATIONS

Average # of presentations from lab (PI or grad students) given over the last 3 years (1pt each, if invited 2pts each)

STUDENT/POSTDOC MENTORSHIP

Avg. Number of students mentored as major professor over last 3 years (3pts each)

Avg. Number of postdocs mentored over last 3 years (2pts each)

Avg. Number of students mentored as committee member over last 3 years (1pt each)

RESEARCH SERVICE

Some service in the research sector (journal reviews, service on grant panels, editorship for journals, service at society meetings) – 1pt
Substantial service in the research sector – 2pts

EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN RESEARCH

Activities such as organizing research symposium, developing large collaborative grant proposal, winning research award, securing patents, germplasms, etc. (1pt for each activity)

CONTRIBUTION TO STUDENT SUCCESS

Evidence of some contribution = 1pt
Evidence of substantial contribution = 2pts

Total minimum scores (i.e. the Standard; score of 3) will differ based on faculty rank as follows:

Assistant Professors

| | |
|---|----------|
| | 3 |
| 25% appt and/or <3yrs in rank | 13 |
| 50% appt | 18 |
| 75% appt | 23 |

Associate/Full Professors

| | |
|---|----------|
| | 3 |
| 25% appt and/or <3yrs in rank | 15 |
| 50% appt | 20 |
| 75% appt | 25 |

Extension Guidelines for the Department of Poultry Science for Tenure-Track Faculty

The Standard

Service to society refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. It can include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management and technical assistance. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion and tenure if the following conditions are met:

1. There is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. There is a direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. The ultimate purpose is for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele.
5. There is a clear relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission.

It is the candidate's responsibility to communicate a clear and compelling story that describes the issues, the strategies, the accomplishments and the impacts of their work and to demonstrate scholarship and accomplishment such that program excellence is evident. A summarized list of programmatic outputs and short description of their programmatic impact is the first step in demonstrating productivity for annual evaluation. Your annual effort should indicate a direction and demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing an innovative Poultry Science Extension program that is based on industry and societal clientele needs related to Poultry Science. The following sections provide a framework for documenting evidence of scholarship in Extension programming within the narrative:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Issue identification | Why is this issue important? |
| 2. Review of the science | What science is available to underpin this effort or what gaps need to be addressed by research? |
| 3. Statement of objectives or hypotheses with outcomes clearly identified | What is the intended result of this work? |
| 4. Educational products developed or enhanced | What creativity or innovation can be demonstrated? |
| 5. Resources acquired | Demonstrate entrepreneurship in developing and delivering programs. |
| 6. Delivery methods | Why was this method selected? |
| 7. Effectiveness evidenced by impact assessment | Did this work make a difference for the target audience? |

Documentation

The Elements reporting tool provides an annual report feature that will capture the activity that has been entered for the year. The following should be an outcome of the annual report:

1. Development of extension bulletins, peer-reviewed articles, books, book chapters, handbooks, newsletters, fact-sheets, web-based publications, other electronic products, CD's, posters, trade journal articles, etc. that address on-going or emerging needs of Georgia's poultry industry.
2. Development and coordination of high impact programming such as workshops, short courses, in-service training of extension agents and vocational agriculture teachers, in the area of the individual's expertise.
 - a. Listing of the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (e.g. curriculum, course, workshop), the duration, the candidate's role in creating each, the target audience and the method of reaching the audience (e.g. conference presentation, site visit).
 - b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.
3. Establishment of extramurally-funded applied research programs in poultry science that contribute to a segment of the Georgia poultry industry.
 - a. Listing of publications relating to service to society including books, book chapters, articles and scholarly papers (indicate if peer-reviewed).
 - b. Quality and impact of written documents produced, including knowledge integration, creative solutions, technical manuals or other outcomes of applied research as evaluated by clientele and peers.
4. Development of a niche of expertise that is recognized by the Georgia poultry industry and provides a solid academic reputation with the industry sector pertaining to the candidate's expertise.
 - a. Listing of each type of assistance, the clientele, the contribution and the number of times provided.
 - b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.
5. Establishment and sustainment of applied, industry-oriented outreach programs for a specific poultry industry sector with national or international stature.
6. Receiving state, regional, national recognition of emerging stature in extension programming and applied research in a discipline of Poultry Science (e.g., honors, awards, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies, etc.). Demonstration that outreach programs ... will be maintained ... (e.g., awards, invited presentations, invitations to provide relevant programs in other states and regions, invitations to serve on industry advisory

committees, recognitions within professional societies, invitations to serve on funding review panels, service on editorial boards, evidence of high impact articles, etc.).

Student success activities in Outreach/Extension

As specified in University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3, criteria for promotion and tenure shall include evaluation of faculty members’ involvement in student success activities. Student success activities is a comprehensive term for faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort, but is included within the faculty member’s allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable.

Assessment will focus on documenting a faculty member’s quality involvement in a small number of student success activities. The University provides an exhaustive list of student success activities that can apply for instruction, research, service and/or administrative appointments. The faculty in the Department of Poultry Science have decided to emphasize some of the possible activities that could apply to a faculty members’ assigned effort, but this emphasis does not exclude the use of other related student success activities by a faculty member.

In the lists below, the column “How to capture” indicates how the specific item can be documented in UGA Elements. When there is no entry in that column for a particular item, the item/s will need to be documented in a separate synopsis document for annual evaluation.

| Name and description | How to capture |
|---|--|
| Advising student organizations | Elements >> Admin >> Extracurricular advising... |
| Writing letters of recommendation for students | |
| Introducing students to industry partners/potential employers | |
| Attending student talk and poster presentations organized by other professors, at the department or college levels, etc | Elements >> Admin >> Event participation |
| Introducing students to alumni that have similar interests (at conferences, etc) | |
| Organizing out-of-class social activities | Elements >> Admin >> Event administration |
| Including students in planning for seminars, conferences, etc | |
| Involvement in recruitment and retention (e.g. 4H/FFA judging events, Open House, Avian Academy) | Elements >> Admin >> Event participation &/or Event administration |
| Development of internship programs in the poultry, agribusiness, and/or life science sectors | |

Extension Guidelines for the Department of Poultry Science for Public Service Ranks

The Standard

Service to society refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. It can include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management and technical assistance. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion and tenure if the following conditions are met:

1. There is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. There is a direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. The ultimate purpose is for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele.
5. There is a clear relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission.

It is the candidate's responsibility to communicate a clear and compelling story that describes the issues, the strategies, the accomplishments and the impacts of their work and to demonstrate scholarship and accomplishment such that program excellence is evident. A summarized list of programmatic outputs and short description of their programmatic impact is the first step in demonstrating productivity for annual evaluation. Your annual effort should indicate a direction and demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing an innovative Poultry Science Extension program that is based on industry and societal clientele needs related to Poultry Science. The following sections provide a framework for documenting evidence of scholarship in Extension programming within the narrative:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Issue identification | Why is this issue important? |
| 2. Review of the science | What science is available to underpin this effort or what gaps need to be addressed by research? |
| 3. Statement of objectives or hypotheses with outcomes clearly identified | What is the intended result of this work? |
| 4. Educational products developed or enhanced | What creativity or innovation can be demonstrated? |
| 5. Resources acquired | Demonstrate entrepreneurship in developing and delivering programs. |
| 6. Delivery methods | Why was this method selected? |
| 7. Effectiveness evidenced by impact assessment | Did this work make a difference for the target audience? |

Documentation

PSA - This rank is comparable to that of associate professor.

SPSA - This rank is comparable to that of professor.

1. Competency should be demonstrated by academic preparation and/or experience in a field appropriate to the duties of the position.
2. A documented record of consistent productivity of superior quality and demonstrated impact is required. Impact should be substantiated with quantitative and/or qualitative evidence that conveys significant and direct results of the faculty member's unique expertise and/or contributions. Impact is typically measured by applicability to society and demonstrates response to a pressing issue or need. Evidence of impact can be multifaceted due to the broad range of public service and outreach activities. Following are examples that are intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive, but may be helpful in thinking about the impact of work.
 - Identify direct and indirect beneficiaries of candidate's work: What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work?
 - Demonstrate candidate's efforts have been sustained and transformative for a professional association, government agency, or non-academic community.
 - Evaluate one's own applied research to include potential or actual impact on policies and practices.
 - Provide quantitative evidence (e.g. increased production or widespread adoption of a product or technique, changes in test scores) and qualitative evidence (e.g., testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics).
 - Describe evidence of candidate's innovation on clients or other end users (e.g., local or regional adoption of original work or recommended best practices).
 - Cite impact of the candidate's scholarly work within his/her own disciplinary field.
 - Demonstrate impact of work that helped create new businesses, jobs, promotions, or leadership opportunities.
 - Assess teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the classroom, including the impact of learning on practice, application, and policy.
 - Demonstrate impact of faculty member's efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity.
 - Evaluate work based on systematic and ongoing peer evaluations.
 - Show impact on advancing knowledge, new methodologies or significant changes to existing methods, public benefits of the research, and communication with and validation by peers (e.g., peer-reviewed articles).
 - Describe mutually beneficial community-university partnerships that address critical community needs.
 - Document one's contributions to large scale projects and grand challenges.
 - Measure impact of work against pre-determined benchmarks.
3. Tangible evidence of contributions to the body of knowledge or practice in his/her chosen field is required. Academic-based public service work requires the creation of new processes and programs that are grounded in the concepts and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields. As such, this work is expected to be shared with colleagues and constituents for discussion, critique, and use. Knowledge dissemination ultimately assures that new information is

communicated to broader audiences and updated approaches are added to fields of study and practice. A level of tangible evidence of contributions to the body of knowledge or practice is expected for public service associates and senior public service associates commensurate with rank. For public service associates, evidence should help define the candidate's emerging stature as a regional or national authority; and, for senior public service associates, outcomes should indicate national or international recognition in their fields. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Jointly or individually published abstracts, papers, books, technical manuals, policy notes, monographs, or case-reports
 - Invited presentations at regional or national meetings
 - Poster presentations
 - Association honors, awards, fellowships
 - Evidence of candidate's work that has been referenced in the published literature or adopted outside his/her geographic work area
 - Serving as a reviewer or guest editor for peer-reviewed journal
 - Authoring or co-authoring conference proceedings or white-papers
 - Serving as a regional or national consultant or on a review panel
 - Participating as a discussant or expert authority for regional and national forums
 - Developing electronic programs or websites that have been routinely accessed
 - Evidence of candidate's work picked up by regional or national press
4. A documented record of collaboration with another public service and outreach unit and/or academic department at an accredited institution of higher education is required, clearly specifying the level of the candidate's contribution.
5. PSA - Recognition as a regional and/or national leader in his/her field is required. (Regional is defined as any area outside a person's assigned geographic responsibility, specified in the candidate's job description.)
- SPSA - Distinguished reputation as a national and/or international leader in his/her chosen field is required.

A documented record of professional growth and development is required.

Guidelines for Service in the Department of Poultry Science for Faculty

Committee or similar work in faculty governance bodies at Department, College, and/or University level is expected. Once promoted to Associate Professor it is expected the faculty member will take the leadership role on a committee.

This does not include activities for government, industrial and professional associations, or other educational institutions. The work done in these capacities usually involve significant use of the candidate's expertise (e.g. consultant, Journal editor, Reviewer for referred journals, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions). These would be included under the candidate's assigned allocation of effort of Administration, Extension, Research, or Teaching.

Under the University guidelines, any assigned allocation of effort of 10% or less is not evaluated on an individual basis and therefore becomes part of the candidates Administration, Extension, Research, or Teaching appointments.

Appendix A



Department of Poultry Science
College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

2023 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

To:

From: Todd Applegate

Date:

Attachment(s): UGA Elements annual activity report; Annual Faculty Activity Report

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual and section 4.4, Faculty Evaluations Systems of the University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook.

Your assigned allocation of effort this year was: AY/FY appointment [%] Instruction, [%] Research, and [0 %] Extension/Public Service, and [0 %] administration (or other _____)

Instruction – [5-Exemplary, 4-Exceeds, 3-Meets, 2-Needs Improvement, 1-Does Not Meet]

EXPECTATIONS

| Criteria | #, Amount, Description | 5-Exemplary | 4-Exceeds Expectation | 3-Meets Expectation | 2-Needs Improvement | 1-Does Not Meet Expectations |
|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Teaching load (AY 0.25 EFT=6 cr/AY; FY 0.25 EFT=8 cr/FY) | | | | | | |
| Teaching Effectiveness | | | | | | |
| End of course surveys (60% return rate) | | | | | | |
| Efforts to improve based on feedback | | | | | | |
| Other (course revision, curricular involvement, experiential learning, teaching awards, publication, independent studies) | | | | | | |

| Student Success Activities & Instructional Service | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Documentation (eg. New course, review session, active learning, mentoring of student TA, peer teaching evaluations, field study, study abroad, mentoring students, advising student clubs, etc.) | | | | | | |
| Leadership in Instruction | | | | | | |
| <i>Instruction Evaluation Summary</i> | | | | | | |

Comments:

Research – [5-Exemplary, 4-Exceeds, 3-Meets, 2-Needs Improvement, 1-Does Not Meet]

EXPECTATIONS

| Criteria (3 yr rolling avg) | #, Amount, Description | 5-Exemplary | 4-Exceeds Expectation | 3-Meets Expectation | 2-Needs Improvement | 1-Does Not Meet Expectations |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Publications | | | | | | |
| # publications submitted (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| # publications from PIs lab (4 pt) | | | | | | |
| # publications as co-author (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| # book chapters (2 pt) | | | | | | |
| Funding | | | | | | |
| # Intramural grants (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| # non-federal < \$100K (2 pt) | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| # non-federal > \$100K | | | | | | |
| # federal grants < \$100K (3 pt) | | | | | | |
| # federal grants > \$100K (5 pt) | | | | | | |
| Presentations | | | | | | |
| # from lab (1 pt; 2 pt if invited) | | | | | | |
| Student/Postdoc mentorship | | | | | | |
| # grad students mentored (3 pt) | | | | | | |
| # postdocs mentored (2 pt) | | | | | | |
| # student committees (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| Research Service | | | | | | |
| Service in research sector (e.g. journal reviews, grant panels, editorship, service at society meetings) (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| Substantial service in research (2 pt) | | | | | | |
| Leadership in Research | | | | | | |
| Activities including organizing symposia, large collaborative grant proposals, research awards, | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| patents, germplasms (1 pt each) | | | | | | |
| Contribution to Student Success | | | | | | |
| Some contribution (1 pt) | | | | | | |
| Substantial contribution (2 pt) | | | | | | |
| <i>Research Evaluation Summary</i> | | | | | | |

Comments:

Extension/Public Service – [5-Exemplary, 4-Exceeds, 3-Meets, 2-Needs Improvement, 1-Does Not Meet] EXPECTATIONS

| Criteria (for Assistant rank) | #, Amount, Description | 5-Exemplary | 4-Exceeds Expectation | 3-Meets Expectation | 2-Needs Improvement | 1-Does Not Meet Expectations |
|--|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Recognized niche of expertise | | | | | | |
| Documentation of programmatic impact | | | | | | |
| Publications (breadth & quality) | | | | | | |
| Development & coordination of impactful program (e.g. workshops, short-courses, in-service) | | | | | | |
| Extramural funding | | | | | | |
| Scope of impact | | | | | | |
| Recognition for disciplinary stature (honors, invited talks, invited service on boards/committees/ panels) | | | | | | |
| Student Success Activities | | | | | | |
| (advising/mentoring, out-of-class student activities, student recruitment/retention, internship development, | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| student-industry interactions) | | | | | | |
| Leadership & Service in Extension/ Outreach | | | | | | |
| <i>Extension Evaluation Summary</i> | | | | | | |

Comments:

Service to society, the University and the profession; professional development

The department expects service to society, the University and the profession that all faculty members must meet; and an expectation that faculty members are actively engaged in professional development

| Criteria | #, Amount, Description | 5- Exemplary | 4-Exceeds Expectation | 3-Meets Expectation | 2-Needs Improvement | 1-Does Not Meet Expectations |
|--|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Committee work at Dept. College, and/or University | | | | | | |
| Leadership in service | | | | | | |
| <i>Service Evaluation Summary</i> | | | | | | |

Comments:

OVERALL EVALUATION – [5-Exemplary, 4-Exceeds, 3-Meets, 2-Needs Improvement, 1-Does Not Meet] EXPECTATIONS

[This section should provide an overall assessment of performance in relation to the individual's assigned allocation of effort. If a majority of the faculty member's assigned time receives a rating of a 1 or a 2, the overall evaluation must be unsatisfactory.]

Dr. is making satisfactory progress towards the next level of review (tenure/promotion to Associate Professor). Satisfactory progress in any one year does not guarantee that the faculty member will be successful in promotion and/or tenure.

Please sign below to acknowledge that you have been apprised of the content of your annual written evaluation. Your signature only acknowledges receipt of your written annual evaluation and does not imply agreement. You may respond to this report in writing, including by noting any factual errors and/or errors in omission. That response must be submitted within 10 working days of the date of electronic or other documented delivery of your evaluation. Any such response will be attached to your annual written evaluation. Your evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of your response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of your written response, within 10 working days. Any written responses by you and your evaluator will become part of the official personnel records.

Todd Applegate, Head of the Department of Poultry Science
Name and Title of Evaluator

Signature of Evaluator

Date

Signature of Faculty Member being evaluated

Date